Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a fusion of the old and new, a compromise between the requirements of the purists and the freedom of Hardy's scenery, just as in *la Veuve* he had invented a middle term for the unity of time. But he was forced to give up the former as he had been obliged to yield the latter. Compromises were not in favor in his day, and are in fact but seldom met with in the annals of French history or literature. The spectator recognized in *le Cid* the fixed, multiplex decoration, not neccessarily indefinite as Rigal supposes, otherwise Scudéry could hardly have written "presque sans changer de face," or the Academy have ranked it with the majority of the plays of the time. But instead of remaining within the various rooms bordering on the central open space, as in *Médée* and *la Place Royale*, or delaying on the thresholds, as in many of the scenes of Corneille's early comedies, the characters in *le Cid* came entirely away from their respective abiding-places and stood in the middle of the stage. Thus it may be easily explained why the last four scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality, as Corneille himself acknowledges. For these were connected by the characters of each speaking to one another, while the first scenes were separated from one another and from the following four by their entire lack of such communication. In the first two scenes of the original play the open square was the real place of the action, but in the third scene it was the assumed place, the Infanta and her attendants evidently coming thither from the door of her apartment (note the stage direction for line 61, *Le Page rentre*). Besides, the presence of a part of the audience on the sides of the stage forces us to allow that all the dialogue was carried on in the middle, while Corneille's admission that the four last scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality would indicate that he considered the first three definite. The only way this definiteness could be gained would be by the actors advancing from the buildings where they were supposed to be—as the dramatist had conceded in his previous plays and as he argued for in the *Discours des Trois Unités*. And this they must have done in the disconnected scenes of *le Cid*, while in those which were joined more closely together, one actor remained in the square and the others came to him.

Here is the "theatrical fiction," a unity of place which satisfied neither the crowd, fond of spectacular effects, nor the strict disciples of Aristotle and Horace. And so it had to go the way Corneille's compromise for unity of time had gone. The outcome of the struggle was the banishment of general subjects from the classical stage of France. The scenery of *le Cid*, as Corneille planned it, would have seemed narrow and hesitating to the most indulgent of romanticists, yet it was still too varied for the Academy and the Hôtel de Rambouillet. Accordingly its author was forced to his last concession to their demands, and "Le théâtre est une chambre à quatre portes. Il faut un fauteuil pour le roi" (stage register of 1673), was the final realization of Corneille's words in the *Discours des Trois Unités*, of 1660.

F. M. Warren.

Adelbert College.

GERMAN LOAN-WORDS AND THE SECOND SOUND SHIFTING.

It is well established that at different times, from the beginning of the O.H.G. period up to the late Middle Ages, certain consonant changes have taken place in the Upper German dialects. These changes are collectively known as the Second Sound Shifting, although not all consonants have permutated simultaneously throughout the whole linguistic area. It is rightly assumed that barring peculiar irreducible consonant groups and crossing influences, this change took place uniformly within the whole language, and that Modern High German represents the group of the Second Sound Shifting.*

German philologists are accustomed to subject loan-words to the test of native words and to judge of the approximate age of their introduction by the manner in which the permutations have taken place. They seem to forget that what is true of changes within the language is not *eo ipso* true of changes in newcomers whose foreign garb marks them as belonging to a special class. As far as I know, no one has as yet attempted to investigate German loan-words properly, for Kluge's etymologies cannot be regarded in this light. His method of putting foreign words to the test of the sound mutation leads him to some strange and amusing results.

---

*This is not the common view. H. C. G. v. J.

Kluge[1] regards the affricata *pf* as the surest sign of an early borrowing, and to this *pf* we we shall mainly devote our attention. Under *Pfalz* we find: "As the permutation of L.G. *p* to H.G. *pf* indicates, the word must have been naturalized in G. as early as the beginning of the eighth century." Hence he argues that *Pfahl*, *Pfosten*, *Pflanze* had been introduced before the O.H.G. period. But it cannot be denied that the same O.H.G. has the words *Paar*, *Pacht*, *Palme*, *Pech*, *Petersilie* and many other words with unmutated *p*, and there is no reason to think that these are of a younger date than the former. Under *Treppe* he gives a form *Trepfe* for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Are we to suppose two distinct borrowings from the North for it, one before and one after these two centuries? And how did the sound all of a sudden shift so late? Under *Pforte* we find: "Borrowed in the O.H.G. period in the eighth century, from Latin *porta* hence the absence of the premutation of *t* to *z*, which had been accomplished even in the seventh century." But we have learned above that the change to *pf* had been accomplished before the beginning of the eighth century, so there is left only the uncomfortably narrow limit between the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, in which to slip *porta* into the language.

And now, since *t* has changed to *z* before the seventh century, Kluge places *Ziegel* in the fifth or sixth century. *Tafel*, says he, is borrowed in the O.H.G. period, *Zabel*, of course, to suit his theory, is older than O.H.G. But what reason is there to suppose that *Ziegel* like all other architectural terms is older than *Turm*, O. H. G. *turri*, *turra?* And what are we to do with *Ketzer* from *καθαρός* in the eleventh century (*θ* at that time could have come in only through the medium of Latin *th* or *t*), which shows a shifting at such a late time?

Words introduced by the Church into Germany, Kluge says, show no mutation; yet Christianity was known and generally accepted in Upper Germany long before the eighth century, before *p* had gone over to *pf*, and he can adduce no good reason why *Pfaffe* should be older than *Papst* and *Pfarrer* than *predigen*.

These few examples illustrate the improper treatment of loan-words. The first mistake made by philologists in dealing with them arises from a misconception of the manner in which sound changes take place and perpetuate themselves. Winteler[2] says by implication that Upper German consonantism differs from Northern consonantism in that it distinguishes quantity of explosive sounds and not quality: *b* and *p*, *g* and *k*, *d* and *t* differ only by a greater or lesser pressure of the respective organs, and are all voiceless. H.G. *p*, *k*, *t*, when used in words which the Swiss hear for the first time are reproduced by them in an aspirated or affricated form, namly *ph*, *kh* or *kχ*, *th*. The main features of the second sound shifting are greatly due to this U.G. aspiration. This, doubtless, has been a characteristic of U. G. speech upwards of ten centuries, and the O.H.G. and M.H.G. graphic signs *ph*, *ch*, *th* merely mark the first steps towards a stronger enunciation resulting in affricatae in two of the three sounds. *The second sound shifting owes its origin primarily to a particular locality and a particular people, not to a particular time.* At a later time, when the art of writing becomes general, this native change may be retarded and it may even retrograde, but of this I shall speak later. This affrication is going on to-day as much as in the time of the Carlovingians, and will go on, as long as books and a closer intercourse with the learned do not exert a corrective influence.

Before entering upon a further discussion of the Germanic sound shifting, I shall illustrate the working and persistency of sound substitution in some Russian loan-words. In Russian as well as other Slavic idioms, *f* exists only in foreign words. In native words the voiced dento-labial spirant frequently becomes voiceless before consonants and finally, so that in reality *f* is not an impossible sound to a Russian. Ever since the introduction of Christianity, Greek θ has been pronounced as *f* in Russian, hence *Afiny*, *Korinf*, *Fomá* (Thomas). And even to-day a Slav's first attempt to pronounce *I think* is sure to result in *I fink*. In White Russian, *f* is preserved in all such foreign words as the White Russian continually hears pronounced by Germans and Poles living in his midst, but he invariably at first hearing will change all his *f*'s of foreign words to *χv* or even *χ*. So, while we find in W. Russian *fura*, *figura*, *fefer*, *fal'š*, other foreign words *fon*, e.g. *ar fest*, *fortuna*, *fartuk*, *oficér* become *χvonar*, *χvest*, *χvortuna*, *χvartuk*, *aχvicer*; and the Graeco-Russian names *Θeodosij*, *Θeodor* become *Xvedós*, *Xvjódor* or even *Xadós*, *Xadór*. Now *χv* has been for many centuries a distinctive Russian combination, and in two out of six O. Slavonic words with initial *χv* recorded by Miklosich, Russian influence is suspected.[3] We see here a process of sound mutation in operation for many centuries and one not likely soon to cease.

---

[1] Kluge's *Etymological Dictionary*, fourth edition, London, 1891. Since writing this I have consulted the fifth edition; there is no improvement there in the treatment of loan-words.

[2] J. Winteler, "*Die Kerenzer Mundart des Kantons Glarus in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt.*' 1876.

In Silesian dialects the initial affricata *pf* has advanced to simple *f*, while medial and final *pf* or *f* have retrograded to *p*,[4] but owing to book influence *pf* is still felt as a legitimate correspondent to L.G. or foreign *p*;[5] hence we find the forms *Supfe*, *Trepfe*, *Klapfer*, *Klumpfen*, and what is still stranger, Polish *pieniądze* has undergone sound shifting and has become *Phinunse*.[6] Another example of aspiration is *Tôbich* for *Tabak*,[7] which is certainly a modern word. More frequently, however, the reverse process of softening has taken place in consequence of the checking influence of books.[8]

In the Kerenz dialect initial *pf* corresponds to U.G. *pf*.[9] Loanwoards introduced through modern German change their initial *p* to *ph*, while those that came in through M.H.G. (book-language) show unmutated *p* or even *b*. Now *ph* is the nearest approach to *pf*: *Phak* Pack, *phur* pur, *Phersu* Person, *Phauli* Paul, "ein in Bauernfamilien noch fremder Name."[10] So, too, Gothic *k* has become *x*, while M.H.G. *k* invariably sounds *kx* (*kχ*), and in other Swiss dialects *kx* corresponds to organic Gothic *k*.[11]

When we say that in Upper German the permutation *pf* for *p* was accomplished in the seventh century, we merely mean that it was then universally accomplished for native words, but the change in newly introduced foreign words may take place for many centuries later and is not excluded even to-day in cases where book influence is not possible.

Another error is to suppose that all foreign words adopted before the seventh century must have undergone the soundchange together with native words. If the origin of the word is not transparent and it offers no strange combinations, then naturally it is subjected to the same treatment as German words. The word, however, may have originated in Latin books and its origin may long be present in the mind of the speaker, or it may be a Romance word for some commodity or luxury accessible only to the upper classes, who are aware of its foreign origin or even are conversant with the foreign language. In this case a word may withstand the sound shifting for an indefinite time, or, at some later time, it may become the common property of the lower classes and it may undergo the sound change.

---

[3] Franz Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*, I, 239.

[4] Karl Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialectforschung*, etc., p. 73.

[5] *Ibid.* Meines wiszens wird nur (ausz religiöser Scheu) in Schepfer *creator* das *pf* rein gesprochen; das gefäsz zum schepfen heiszt Schepper. Formen wie Supfe, Trepfe sind wol ausz missverstandener Sucht recht rein zu sprechen zu deuten, oder sind sie die streng hochdeutschen Formen?

[6] *Ibid.* p. 74. Das polnische Wort *pieniadze* Geld (ausz dem deutschen Pfenning entlehnt) hat bei der Rückaufname in das deutschschlesische die Lautverschiebung ergriffen: *Phinunse* (Trebnitz).

[7] *Ibid.* p. 85.

[8] The softening of *p* to *b*, *k* to *g*, *t* to *d*, so common in M.H.G., and the reverse process of hardening no doubt arise from the absence of a quantitive difference between the mediae and tenues in the Upper German dialects. While the sandhi rules of Notker's canon may have had sound foundation in actual differentiation, yet on the whole the interchange of mediae with tenues or, to speak with Winteler, of fortes with lenes is rather arbitrary in M.H.G. The Silesian dialects distinguish between mediae and tenues, but evidently owing to book influence foreign words appear in the M.H.G. form. "Diese Neigung des deutschen, fremde Labialtenuis zu erweichen, wo sie nicht aspiriert wurde, erscheint bekanntlich mhd. in auszgedenter Weise." Weinhold, *ibid*: p. 72.

[9] J. Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 44.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 56. In Uebereinstimmung mit dem mhd. erscheint *b* für welsches *p*, meist im Anlaut, z, B.: *balme*, etc. ......doch baben andere die Fortis behalten, z. B. *par*...... während noch andere, offenbar durch das hochdeutsche vermittelte, die Aspirata aufweisen.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 50 and 52. A curious case of a loss of a supposed U.G. sound mutation is seen in G. *Zins*, Latin *census*, which in O. Saxon became *tins*.

Words referring to Church and religion form a large group of book words whose Latin origin was continually before the eyes of priests and communicants, and it is not to be wondered at that *Priester*, *Papst*, *Dom*, *Pein*, *Plage*, *predigen*, *Kreuz*, *Altar* should show no sound shifting, and yet we find *phîne*, *pflâge*, *pflôge* (Lexer). Where, however, the corrective of the Latin book language was absent and the word was diffused among the masses, the sound change could have taken place even at a later period. There is no reason to doubt the origin of *Pfaffe* from Middle Latin *papa* and *Pfarre* from *parrochia*. What Kluge gives under *Pfaffe* is no proof at all of Greek influence in the German Church. Greek παπᾶς is first mentioned in the fourth Œcumenical Council (A. D. 451);[12] in the following centuries it occurs in the plural form *papadés* in the Roman church and not before we reach the twelfth or the thirteenth century does *papa* become general in the sense of *clericus*.[13] As this word is not found in books of prayer or ritual, it is natural that it should become the full possession of the people in a true Germanic form. Precisely the same is to be said of *parrochia*[14] which being also a Greek word became Latinized at a relatively late time; not being found in the Bible and the prayerbook there was nothing in its way of becoming naturalized. Kluge objects to the loss of the last syllable, but such losses are not rare in German.

So it is by no means strange that *Teppich* should show no sound changes although it is found already in the O.H.G. period. Yet it would have been but fair for Kluge to quote Lexer *in toto* and not to avoid forms which would work against his pet theory of precisely locating the borrowing of a word. Now we find the forms *tepit teppit teppet tept tepich teppich tepech teppech tepch deppich tebich tewich töppich teppît tapît tapet tapeiz* and last not least *zeppet*.[15] So after all a partial sound change occurs, and Kluge would be compelled to place the origin of the word before the seventh instead of into the eighth century. But it is really immaterial what the form of the word is, for the different approximations found in M.H.G. are precisely what we should expect without being driven to as many new derivations as there are forms.

The Germans are supposed to have borrowed a number of architectural terms from the Romans, and if there is any structural form with which the Germans were acquainted earlier than any other it is certainly the tower, the Lat. *turris*. And yet this word has persisted as *turri*, *turra* in O.H.G., *turm*, *turn* in M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. What is Kluge to do with this obstinacy? He simply passes it over in silence. As a matter of course, the Latin word stayed with them as an ever present reminder of Roman power and is no doubt as old as *Tiegel*, *Pfahl* and *Pfosten*.

---

[12] E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. He gives also πάππας as an equivalent for παππᾶς; and since a corresponding word for *clericus* does not occur in the Romance languages, the possibility of *Pfaffe* being merely a popular form of *Papst* is not excluded.

[13] To judge from Du Cange, the word was first introduced into the Roman church by pope Zacharias who was by birth a Greek (eighth century). The nearest examples following this first quotation are all from bulls and chartularies of the time of Innocent iii (end of twelfth century).

[14] Du Cange gives *parofia* as a variation for Middle Latin *parochiad*,and we find this in the form *parafia* as the common word for parish in Polish, and *paropi paropia parrofia parrofi parofi perofia* in the Provençal dialects (Mistral). No doubt *parofia* existed in M.H.G. and it is this form that must have given rise to M.H.G. *pharrhof* (see Lexer, *pharrehof*) in which there is an attempt at popular etymology and which means no more and no less than merely *pfarre*. Now *pfarre* must naturally result out of this combination. This becomes more probable when we consider the other popular etymology *pharreherre* for *pharraere* by the side of it: "ausdeutend entstellt aus *pharraere*, Wack." (Lexer).

[15] Here are a few more examples from Lexer: *panzier panzer* . . . . im 16, jh. bei Erasm, Alberus auch lautverschoben *pfanzer*; *pâr par* . . . *phar*; *patêne patên phatene phaten*; *phahte phaht, md, phacht pacht phât packt*; *phlanzen planzen*(!); *plâge pflâge pflôge*; *tambûr tambûre tanbûr tabûr tapûr timbur tamber zambûr*(! !); *timît dimît zimît* We certainly could not regard *zambûr*, from French *tambour* as introduced before the seventh century.

The tendency of ascribing culture and cultivation of plants to Rome, I am afraid, has gone too far. De Candolle shows conclusively that certain kinds of plums[16] are indigenous to the central European plain, and that the cherry[17] and the pear[18] had been cultivated in Germany from time immemorial. We should not assume a Roman origin except where it can be proved historically that the first importation came from Italy. A coincidence of sounds with the serviceable second sound shifting can at best be only adduced as a proof of common possession.[19]

Although *Pfirsich* exhibits the permutations completely it is very doubtful whether it was known in Germany before the M.H.G. period, and its absence from O.H.G. is not at all so strange. The earliest example in Littré under *pêche* is of the thirteenth century and the English *peach* shows that it is a late French importation. *Rettig*, according to Kluge, comes directly from Latin *radicem* before the O.H.G. period on account of its final guttural. As a matter of fact *radix* received the particular meaning of *rap hanus* on French soil, as *raditz rais*, etc., in Provençal and *radis* in French indicate, hence it is more likely that the radish became known as an edible root from France. Altogether French importations have been placed by several centuries too late, and many of the southern fruits were more likely introduced from France, such as the fig, the peach.[20]

The Spanish boot of the second sound shifting has been rigorously applied by Kluge to the ending of words and with disastrous results. When a foreign word is introduced into the native language with a different sound system, the tendency will be to so transform it as to give it a native appearance. The sound mutation is a powerful agent in this direction, but it affects only the first part of the word which in German corresponds to the accented root syllable of the word.[21] In the following unaccented syllables the sound mutation according to the strict law does not always produce the desired effect, and more convenient transformations which follow the law of least resistance take place. Strange syllables receive the native garb, and dialectically *patata* becomes *Patak*,[22] *Appetit Apetīk*[23] and *Tabak Tôbich*.[24] The more a word becomes the possession of the people at large the greater the change must be if it departs too much from the native form.

For the change of endings native syllabic combinations must be kept in mind. The M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. *-ig -ich* (*ch* after liquids) is a syllable of least resistance, and foreign *-ic -it -ec -et -ac -at -j* etc., are liable to take this ending, hence such forms as *Rettig Pfirsich Essig Mönch Kelch Teppich predigen Käfig*.[25]

Unusual combinations may be transformed. The change of *turr* to *Turm* (: *Sturm*, *Wurm*) is such an instance. Frequently all the changes combined are not sufficient to produce the desired result, and then popular etymology comes into play and still further transforms the combination. Such attempts are seen for example in M.H.G. *pforzich* which we find as *phorzeich vörzich forzaichen furzog*.

When we deal with loan-words in modern German, all these facts must be considered. Besides, as often is the case, peculiar dialectic forms may survive, and it is not necessary to resort to the second sound shifting to locate the word. Phonetic studies are not the end of etymological investigation of these words but merely an assistance in the chronological data of sources. Loan-words must mainly be studied historically and the second sound shifting must not be juggled with.

---

[16] Alph. de Candolle, *Origine des Plantes Cultivées*, p. 170.

[17] *Ibid.* p. 165.

[18] *Ibid.* p. 183.

[19] Even if the word be taken from Latin there is not sufficient ground to assume an importation of the plant from Rome The horseradish is known throughout Germany as *Meerrettig*, but in some parts of Austria the Slavic form *Kren* has survived. This in itself is not a proof that the plant has been imported from Russia.

[20] It will be noticed that *Feige*, *Dattel*, *Zwiebel* resemble much more the French words *figue*, *datte* (Italian *dattilo*), *ciboule* than Latin *ficus*, *dactylus*, *caepulla*. The latter would have given quite different results.

[21] Hence generally the accent is drawn back to the first syllable.

[22] Kluge, *Etym. Dictionary* sub *Kartoffel*.

[23] Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 56.

[24] Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialektforschung*, p. 85.

[25] Other M.H.G. words are: *prisilig* for *prisilje*, 'brasilienholz,' *bederich* for *pheteraere* 'petraria;' *phorzich phorzeich*, 'porticus.'

LEO WIENER.

Missouri State University.

JUBINAL'S "ÉVANGILE AUX FEMMES."

IN 1835 Achille Jubinal published a book entitled: *Jongleurs et Trouvères, ou Choix de Saluts, Épîtres, Rêveries et autres pièces légères des XIIIe et XIVe siècles.* Among the poems here published was the "Évangile aux Femmes" (pp. 26–33), which was known to him to exist in three MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. In the following pages will be noticed the manner in which he used these three MSS.: A, B and C, in the constitution of his text.

A contains thirty-three quatrains, B sixteen quatrains, and C thirty-two quatrains. The text of A he disregarded almost altogether, leaving twelve of its quatrains unpublished, and made C the basis of his text, though pretending to follow the others (at least in regard to the order of quatrains).

Since the quatrains occur in a different order in each of the MSS., the editor chose to follow in the main the order of C; but as he considered B to have the best text, he followed B's text whenever a quatrain was contained in B. When he came near the end of the poem he noticed that several quatrains which occur in B are not to be found in C, so he inserted these quatrains here and there among those of C. He seems to have made use of A only eight times: the first time by putting the first quatrain of A in place of the third quatrain of C to which it corresponds; five times by substituting a word from A which seemed to make better sense; and twice by giving in a footnote a quatrain not found in either of the other two MSS.

A point to be noted in regard to his use of A is that in five cases he gives a quatrain as occurring in C alone (which he always indicates by an asterisk), whereas it really does occur in A also, although wanting in B. His slighting of A is probably due to the fact of its greater age which made its decipherment more difficult for him.

I have examined Jubinal's text in the light thrown on it by copies of MSS. A and B, and by a part copy, part collation (of Constans' text, *Marie de Compiègne*, 1876) of MS. C. The following is a tabulated statement of the chief results:

Jubinal's Sources.

J1 =C1 (AB wanting),
J2 =C2, putting verse 2 last (AB wanting),
J3 =A1 (C3, B1),
J4 =B2, except *traient* from A2 (C5, B1),
J5 =B3 (C4, A3),
J6 =C6 (AB wanting),
J7 =C7 (AB wanting),
J8 =C8 (A8, B8 are somewhat similar),
J9 =C9 (AB wanting),
J10=C10 (A30, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
J11=C11 (AB wanting),
J12=B4 (C12, A4),
J13=C13 (A16, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
J14=B5, except verse 3 from C14 (C14, A5),
J15=B6, except *cuer* from C15 (C15, A6),
J16=B7, except *apareille, ausi, pourvoit, c'on, com,* which in spelling follow A7 (C16, A7),
J17=C17 (AB wanting),
J18=C18 (A29, B wanting; verse 1 much changed by Jubinal; marked by him as occurring in C alone),
J19=C19 (AB wanting),
J20=C20 (AB wanting),
J21=C21 (A32, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
J22=B10 (C22, A10),
J23=C23 (A11, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
J24=B11 (C24, A12),
J25=B12 (C25 and A15 are similar),
J26=B8 (A8 and C8 are similar),
J27=B9 (C wanting, A9),
J28=C26 (B wanting; A13 and A15 are similar),
J29=C27 (AB wanting),
J30=C28 (AB wanting),
J31=B13 (C wanting, A14),
J32=B14 (C wanting, A17),
J33=C29 (AB wanting),
J34=C30 (AB wanting),
J35=C31 (AB wanting),